UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,964	03/30/2001	Lev Brouk	ODVFP009A	3907

22434 7590 11/12/2009

Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER	
LEE, PHILIP C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2448	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/12/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO@wavsip.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/820,964	BROUK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PHILIP C. LEE	2448	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 August 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-8 and 15-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,5-8 and 15-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7/30/09*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on August 31, 2009.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 15-26 are presented for examination and claims 4 and 9-14 are canceled.

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action.

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

6. Claims 17, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bakshi et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2009/0019534 (hereinafter Bakshi).

7. As per claim 17, Bakshi teaches the invention as claimed for authenticating services participating in routing of a message in a message routing network, comprising:

before the routing of the message in the message routing network:

authenticating an enterprise to the message routing network ([0171] and [0120]);

associating an identifier with the enterprise, the identifier provided by the message routing network responsive to authentication of the enterprise to the message routing network, the identifier indicating authentication of the enterprise to the message routing network ([0171] and [0120]);

authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider ([0120] and [0121]);

associating the identifier with an account of the enterprise at the first service provider responsive to the enterprise being authenticated to the first service provider, such that the identifier further indicates authentication of the enterprise to the enterprise account at the first service provider ([0120] and [0121]);

such that when a message including said identifier is received from a sender of the message, authentication of only said message routing network by a receiver of said message using the identifier included in the message provides authentication of the sender of the message ([0122] and [0125]-[0128]).

8. As per claim 18, Bakshi teaches the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Bakshi further teaches wherein the sender of the message is the enterprise ([0171] and [0120]).

9. As per claim 21, Bakshi teaches the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Bakshi further teach wherein authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider includes providing the identifier to the first service provider ([0122]).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

10. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakshi in view of Zombek et al, U.S. Patent 6,704,768 (hereinafter Zombek).

11. As per claim 19, Bakshi teaches the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Bakshi does not specifically teach the sender is the first service provider. Zombek teaches wherein the sender of the message is the first service provider (col. 32, line 60-col. 33, line 2).

12. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi and Zombek because Zombek's teaching of sender is the first service provider would increase the security of Bakshi's system by allowing authentication of different sender including the first service provider prior to communication.

13. As per claim 20, Zombek taught the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Bakshi does not specifically teach said identifier is a message routing network ID. Zombek teaches wherein said identifier is a message routing network ID (col. 22, lines 26-29).

14. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi and Zombek because Zombek's teaching of identifier is a message routing network ID would increase the security of Bakshi's system by allowing authentication based on the identifier prior to routing of the message.

15. Claims 1-3 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakshi and Zombek in view of Shiozawa, U.S. Patent Application Publication 20010005358 (hereinafter Shiozawa).

16. Zombek and Shiozawa were cited in the previous office action.

17. As per claim 1, Bakshi teaches the invention substantially as claimed for routing a message between services in a message routing network, comprising:

> before routing the message in the message routing network, associating an identifier with an entity, the identifier provided by said message routing network responsive to authentication of the entity to the message routing network, the identifier indicating authentication of the entity to the message routing network ([0171] and [0120]);

before routing the message in the message routing network, associating said identifier with an account of the entity at a first service responsive to said entity being authenticated to the first service that supports said entity account, such that the identifier further indicates authentication of the entity to the entity account at the first service ([0120] and [0121]);

receiving, from a second service, a message including said identifier, said message being directed to a mapped service ([0122] and [0125]), wherein said mapped service is an entity account-specific representation of said first service and acts as a proxy for said first service ([0126]);

authenticating, by a receiver of said message, a sender of said message by authenticating only said message routing network using said identifier included in said message ([0122] and [0125]-[0128]); and when said message routing network is authenticated using said identifier ([0122] and [0125]-[0128]), transmitting said message for delivery to said first service ([0088]), wherein said message is directed from said mapped service to said first server ([0088]).

18. Bakshi does not teach translating said message. Zombek teaches

translating, by said message routing network, said message for delivery to said first service (col. 32, lines 46-50; col. 32, line 66-col. 33, line 2), wherein said translated message includes said identifier (col. 20, lines 47-52) and is directed from said mapped service to said first service (col. 21, lines 32-53; col. 22, lines 22-29).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi and Zombek because Zombek's teaching of translating message would improve the communication in Bakshi's system by allowing messages to be packaged in different format for communication in a network.

20. Although Bakshi teaches server components as the mapped services ([0122] and [0125]-[0126]), however, Bakshi and Zombek do not teach wherein mapped service is operable to determine whether a route for said message needs to be modified prior to delivery said message to said first service. Shiozawa teaches a mapped service is operable to determine whether a route for a message needs to be modified prior to delivering the message to a destination (page 5, paragraphs 73-76); and the mapped service determines that said route for the message does not need to be modified, the message is delivered to the destination (page 5, paragraphs 72 and 73).

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa because Shiozawa's teaching of determining whether a route for a message needs to be modified would increase the reliability of Bakshi's and Zombek's systems by allowing restoration of data transmission in case of fault occurrence without undesired reduction in efficiency on the use of network bandwidth (page 1, paragraphs 1 and 9).

22. As per claim 2, Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Zombek further teaches wherein said identifier is a message routing network ID (col. 22, lines 26-29).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above.

24. As per claim 3, Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2 above. Zombek further teaches wherein said identifier is a message routing network ID for said mapped service (col. 22, lines 26-29).

25. As per claim 5, Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Zombek further teaches wherein said translating comprises adding an identifier of said entity account to said message (col. 15, lines 26-33).

26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above.

27. As per claim 6, Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Zombek further teaches wherein upon receipt of said translated

message, said first service associates said identifier with said entity account based on a mapping internal to said first service (col. 22, lines 26-29, 51-59).

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above.

29. As per claim 7, Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1 above. Zombek further teaches comprising receiving a second message from said first service, said second message being directed to said mapped service (col. 24, lines 49-56).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above.

31. As per claim 8, Bakshi, Zombek and Shiozawa teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 7 above. Zombek further teaches comprising translating said second message for delivery to said second service (col. 32, lines 66-col. 33, lines 2).

32. Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giroux et al U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0243574 (hereinafter Giroux) and Bakshi in view of Zombek.

33. Giroux was cited in the last office action.

34. As per claim 15, Giroux taught the invention substantially as claimed comprising:

providing a proxy service ((e.g., ASP server, 160, fig. 3) for messages transferred between a first application service provider (110, fig. 3) and a second application service provider (120, fig. 3) in a message routing network (page 3, paragraph 53) (i.e., ASP server 160 providing a proxy service for transferring data from ASP server 110 to ASP server 120), said first application service provider and said second application service provider providing application services (page 1, paragraph 6)

35. Giroux did not specifically teach authentication. Bakshi teaches providing a proxy service for messages transferred in a message routing network [0030];

before routing the messages in the message routing network, associating an identifier with an entity, the identifier provided by said message routing network responsive to authentication of the entity to the message routing network, the identifier indicating authentication of the entity to the message routing network ([0171] and [0120]);

before routing the messages in the message routing network, associating said identifier with an account of the entity at said first application service provider responsive to said entity

being authenticated to said first application service provider, such that the identifier further indicates authentication of the entity to the entity account at said first application service provider ([0120] and [0121]);

receiving, from said second application service, a message including said identifier, said message being directed to said proxy service ([0122] and [0125]), wherein said proxy service is an entity account-specific representation of said first application service provider ([0126]);

authenticating, by a receiver of the message, a sender of the message by only authenticating said message routing network using said identifier included in said message ([0122] and [0125]-[0128]); and

when said message routing network is authenticated using said identifier ([0122] and [0125]-[0128]), transmitting said message for delivery to said first application service provider ([0088]), wherein said message is directed from said proxy service to said first application service provider ([0088]).

36. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Giroux and Bakshi because Bakshi's teaching of authentication would increase the security of Giroux's system by allowing messages to be authenticated prior to communication.

37. Giroux and Bakshi do not teach translating said message. Zombek teaches when said message routing network is authenticated using said identifier (col. 21, lines 32-52; col. 22, lines 4-10; col. 24, lines 49-50), translating, by said message routing network, said message for

delivery to said first application service col. 32, lines 46-50; col. 32, line 66-col. 33, line 2), wherein said translated message includes said identifier (col. 20, lines 47-52) and is directed from said proxy service to said first application service (col. 21, lines 32-53; col. 22, lines 22-29).

38. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Giroux, Bakshi and Zombek because Zombek's teaching of translating message would improve the communication in Giroux's and Bakshi's system by allowing messages to be packaged in different format for communication in a network.

39. As per claim 16, Giroux, Bakshi and Zombek teach the invention substantially as claimed as in claim 15 above. Zombek further teaches wherein said proxy service adds an account identifier to a message that is transmitted to said second application service provider (col. 15, lines 26-33).

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Giroux, Bakshi and Zombek for the same reason as set forth in claim 15 above.

41. Claims 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakshi in view of Sandhu et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 20080052775 (hereinafter Sandhu).

42. As per claim 22, Bakshi teaches the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Bakshi does not teach providing a provisioning token to the first service provider. Sandhu teaches wherein authenticating the enterprise to a first service provider includes providing a provisioning token to the first service provider ([0061]).

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi and Sandhu because Sandhu's teaching of providing provisioning token to the first service provider would improve the security of Bakshi's system by providing additional authentication at the service provider level.

44. As per claim 23, Bakshi the invention as claimed in claim 17 above. Bakshi does not teach providing a confirmation indicating authentication of the enterprise. Sandhu teaches providing a confirmation message to the message interchange network indicating authentication of the enterprise to the first service provider ([0113] and [0156]).

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi and Sandhu because Sandhu's teaching of providing a confirmation indicating authentication of the enterprise would improve the security of Bakshi's system by providing additional authentication at the service provider level.

46. As per claim 24, Bakshi and Sandhu teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 23 above. Sandhu further teaches wherein the confirmation message includes the identifier ([0113] and [0156]).

47. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi and Sandhu for the same reason as claim 23 above.

48. As per claim 25, Bakshi and Sandhu teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 23 above. Sandhu teaches wherein the confirmation message includes the provisioning token ([0113] and [0156]).

49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi and Sandhu for the same reason as claim 23 above.

50. As per claim 26, Bakshi and Sandhu teach the invention substantially as claimed in claim 23 above. Sandhu further teaches designating a time period for receipt of the confirmation message, a provisioning token expiring after passage of the time period ([0113] and [0156]).

51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Bakshi and Sandhu for the same reason as claim 23 above.

52. Applicant's arguments filed 08/31/09 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of rejections.

53. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on (571) 272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip C Lee/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452